



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,263	09/11/2003	Hideto Nakamura	Q77329	3529

7590 07/03/2006
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

GOKHALE, SAMEER K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/659,263	Applicant(s) NAKAMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Sameer K. Gokhale	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-6, the phrase "for inducing a first erasing discharge between said column electrode and one of the row electrodes of said row electrode pair in only discharge cells [i] that have been set to said unlighted discharge cell mode in said selective erasure addressing step; and a second erasing step for inducing a second erasing discharge between the row electrodes of said row electrode pair in only discharge cells [ii] that have been set to said lighted discharge cell mode in said selective write addressing step...." on lines 19-25 of claim 1 and lines 22-28 of claim 4 renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the discharge cells i and ii are referring to different groups of discharge cells as indicated by the two uses of the term "only" above which appears to indicate that they are referring to different groups of discharge cells. However, the phrase "a selective write addressing step for setting said discharge cells to a lighted discharge cell mode by applying a scan pulse to one row electrode of said row electrode pair while applying a data pulse corresponding to said video signal to said column electrode thereby selectively causing a writing discharge in said discharge cells; the sub-fields following said at least two sub-fields include a

selective erasure addressing step for setting said discharge cells to an unlighted discharge cell mode.....” on lines 6-12 of claim 1 and 6-15 of claim 4, appears to indicate that the same discharge cells that set to a lighted discharge cell mode are same discharge cells that are set to a unlighted discharge cell mode. Therefore, it is not clear that the two separate erasing steps mentioned in claims 1 and 4 are meant to apply to two distinct groups of discharge cells or the same groups of discharge cells.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saegusa et al. (US 6,175,194) (hereafter, “Saegusa”) in view of Kishi et al. (US 6,836,261) (hereafter, “Kishi”).

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Saegusa teaches:

a method for driving a display panel in which discharge cells are formed at intersections between a plurality of row electrode pairs corresponding to display lines, and a plurality of column electrodes intersecting with said row electrode pairs (see col. 1, lines 22-24), said display panel being driven in sub-fields (Fig. 3), each field of a video signal being constituted by a plurality of said sub-fields(Fig. 5), wherein:

each of at least two successive sub-fields (Fig. 5, items SF1 and SF2) including a leading sub-field (Fig. 5, item SF1) includes a selective write addressing step for setting said discharge cells to a lighted discharge cell mode by applying a scan pulse to one row electrode of said row electrode pair while applying a data pulse corresponding to said video signal to said column electrode thereby selectively causing a writing discharge in said discharge cells (Fig. 5, see col. 6, lines 47-51, where both SF1 and SF2 contain the step of applying a scan pulse SP to one row electrode while applying a data pulse DP corresponding to said column electrode thereby setting discharge cells to a lighted discharge mode, and thereby causing a writing discharge, by maintaining cells in a lighted discharge mode based on a data pulse of low voltage);

the sub-fields following said at least two sub-fields or leading subfield (Fig. 5, item SF3, of SF2) include a selective erasure addressing step for setting said discharge cells to an unlighted discharge cell mode by applying said scan pulse to one row electrode of said row electrode pair while applying the data pulse corresponding to said video signal to said column electrode thereby selectively causing an erasing discharge in said discharge cells (Fig. 5, where SF3 and SF2 contains the step of applying a scan pulse SP to one row electrode while applying a data pulse DP corresponding to said column electrode causing a discharge in said discharge cells, and this will be an "erasing" discharge when the data pulse is set to not discharge during that subfield);

and an emission sustain step for applying sustain pulses (Fig. 5, items IP) to said row electrode pairs thereby causing a sustain discharge to be repeated a number of times corresponding to a weighting of that sub-field only in said discharge cells that are

in said lighted discharge cell mode (Fig. 6, col. 8, lines 38-54, where the weights given to the sustain discharge for each subfield are shown);

the last sub-field of each field (Fig. 6, item SF 14) includes an erasing step for inducing an erasing discharge (Fig. 6, item E) between said column electrode and one of the row electrodes of said row electrode pair belonging to said discharge cells.

However, Saegusa does not teach a first erasing step for inducing a first erasing discharge between said column electrode and one of the row electrodes of said row electrode pair in only discharge cells that have been set to said unlighted discharge cell mode in said selective erasure addressing step; and a second erasing step for inducing a second erasing discharge between the row electrodes of said row electrode pair in only discharge cells that have been set to said lighted discharge cell mode in said selective write addressing step, said first erasing step and said second erasing step being performed immediately after said emission sustain step.

However, Kishi does teach a first erasing step for inducing a first erasing discharge between said column electrode and one of the row electrodes of said row electrode pair (Fig. 8, Erase period 2) in only discharge cells that have been set to an unlighted discharge cell mode in a selective erasure addressing step (see col. 7, lines 22-29, where cells that were left OFF include cells that have undergone a selective erasure addressing step and thus their erasure is induced by the erase period referred to here); and a second erasing step for inducing a second erasing discharge between the row electrodes of said row electrode pair (Fig. 8, erase period 1) in only discharge cells that have been set to said lighted discharge cell mode in a selective write

addressing step (see col. 7, lines 9-16, where cells that were ON in a preceding sustain discharge period are cells that have been set to a lighted discharge cell mode in a selective write addressing step), said first erasing step and said second erasing step being performed immediately after said emission sustain step (Fig. 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Kishi in the method of Saegusa in order to have two erasing sub-steps within a last erasing step so as to assume that all residual charges are erased by having two erasing pulses.

Regarding claims 2 and 5, Saegusa further teaches the method for driving a display panel further comprising a reset step for initializing all of said discharge cells to said unlighted discharge cell mode (Fig. 6, item Rc, see col. 8, lines 59-61) by causing a universal reset discharge in all discharge cells before said selective write addressing step in only said leading sub-field (see col. 8, lines 59-61).

Regarding claims 3 and 6, Saegusa further teaches a method for driving a display panel wherein intermediate luminance of $N+1$ gradations (Fig. 6 and Fig. 21, where there are 14 gradations of luminance shown) is displayed by inducing sustain charges (Fig. 6, item Ic, see col. 8, line 30) in said emission sustain steps of N leading sub-fields of each field (In Fig. 6, here $N = 13$ and there are emission sustain steps shown for sub-fields 1-13).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed April 11, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive or are rendered moot in light of new grounds for rejection.

Applicant argued (bottom of page 9) that that Saegusa fails to teach a selective writing addressing step for setting the discharge cells to a lighted discharge cell mode by applying a scan pulse to one row electrode of said row electrode pair while applying a data pulse corresponding to said video signal to said column electrode thereby selectively causing a writing discharge in said discharge cells. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Saegusa, col. 6, lines 47-51, teaches the selective write addressing step by setting discharge cells to a non-lighting discharge mode by intersection of a scan pulse and a positive pixel data pulse, while it also "sets" a lighted discharge cell mode via application of a low voltage pulse to the low voltage pixel data pulse, and it is *thereby* selectively causing a writing discharge by discharging the cells to a lighted discharge cell mode during the reset period (see col. 6, lines 1-4) and then only not applying a selective erasure discharge to the selected cells based on the data pulse. Therefore Examiner believes that Saegusa does teach the claimed selective write addressing step.

Applicant's arguments (middle of page 10) regarding the first and second erasing steps are considered moot in light of the new grounds for rejection discussed above.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sameer K. Gokhale whose telephone number is (571) 272-5553. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SKG
June 23, 2006

Sameer Gokhale
Examiner
Art Unit 2629

AMR A. AWAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amr Ahmad Awad", written over a horizontal line.